REMARKS

Claims 21-23, 26-31, and 34-46 are pending in this application. In the outstanding Office Action, claims 22-29 were objected to for informalities. Claims 21-23, 26, 28, 30, 31, 34, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,240,444 ("Fin") in view of United States Patent No. 5,774,670 ("Montulli") and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,473,798 ("Grosser Jr."). Claims 27, 29, 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin in view of Montulli further in view of Grosser, Jr. and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,021,491 ("Renaud"). Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fin in view of Montulli, in further view of Grosser, Jr. and in further view of United States Patent Number 6,115,040 ("Bladow"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 21, 30 and 40 have been amended.

Claim Rejections Under § 103(a)

Claim 40

Claims 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin in view of Montulli, in further view of Grosser, Jr. and in further view of Bladow. Claim 40 as amended recites a system for generating shared views for browsing a web page comprising a host shared view engine for receiving an identification of a slave client computer, intercepting the host request issued by a browser, *determining required cookie data on the host client computer associated with the host request, and providing, via the communications link to the slave client, a message comprising the uniform resource locator and the required cookie data associated with the host request with the web page.*

Claim 40 as amended further recites a the slave client computer comprising *a slave shared view engine for receiving the message from the host client computer, upon receiving the message from the host client, storing a copy of a current state of a client cookie file on the slave client, updating the cookie file on the slave client computer using the required cookie data from the host client received in the message, issuing a slave request for the web page, - the slave request comprising a uniform resource locator corresponding to the web page and*

updated cookie data associated with the web page, and upon a receipt of a termination signal, terminating the communication link with the host computer and restoring the cookie file to an original state using the copy of the client cookie file.

Support for this amendment may be found, for example, on pages 9-13 of the specification. As described in the specification, to share a browsing experience, a user at the host client executes a shared view engine residing on the host client 120a. The user may identify to the shared view engine those slave clients that the user wishes to grant permission to share the browsing experience. The shared view engine may establish a communications link between the host client and the identified slave clients. When the user at the host client requests a Web site from one of the servers, the shared view engine on the host client may obtain, or intercepts, the URL for the requested Web site from the browser. The shared view engine may then send the URL via the communications links to the shared view engines on the identified slave clients

The shared view engines may pass the URL onto their respective browsers which each may respectively request the same Web page from the server. In response, the server may download the content of the requested Web page onto the slave clients. At this point, the host client and the slave clients are all viewing the same content, i.e., sharing the same browsing experience.

In some applications, the host client can only view certain Web sites if it has certain required cookie data. Cookie data for the host client is included in its cookie file. Presumably, the slave clients do not have the required cookie data in their cookie files (although, by coincidence, they might). In this case, the shared view engine may send not only the URL for the Web site, but also any required cookie data to the shared view engines on the slave clients Shared view engines may then update their respective cookie files to include the additional cookie data. In this way, the slave clients will have all the required permissions, etc., to access whatever Web site(s) the host client 120a is viewing.

Fin relates to an Internet page sharing system for clients over a network. A Web sharing manager of a receiving sharing client receives duplicated events (e.g., browser requests) and messages from a web sharing manager of a source sharing client, which causes the browser of a receiving sharing client to execute the duplicate event/messages and which

causes the same web page to be displayed and controlled on all of the sharing clients. All clients, which are computers, include a Web browser, a Web sharing user interface, a redirector (e.g., a common client interface (CCI) redirector), a message redirector and a Web sharing manager. The source client utilizes a redirector to send duplicate events generated by the browser of the source client to one or more receiving clients. The redirector of the receiving clients causes received events to be processed appropriately and routed to the browser in the receiving client for execution.

For example, when a user/client opens a new Web document by explicitly specifying a URL of the document or by clicking a hyperlink to a URL document, the browser sends an event requesting a page from the Web server through a TCP/IP interface. The CCI redirector is pre-registered for monitoring events such as OpenURL to the operating system, which places the event in a queue. The event is eventually routed to the CCI redirector which causes the vent to be routed through a web sharing manager and through a network interface over the network to shared receiving clients.

With respect to claim 40, the Examiner asserts that Fin teaches a shared view engine for receiving an identification of a slave client computer, intercepting the request issued by the browser and providing via the communications link to the slave client, a message comprising the locator. The Examiner admits that Fin fails to specifically disclose that required cookie data is provided along with the requests to the slave client or that the communications link utilizes a tunneling protocol. With respect to the former, the Examiner cites Montulli arguing that "Montulli teaches including cookies in client requests to exchange state information and enable additional functionality . . . and would have allowed state information such as user login information to be shard with slave computers, permitting the slave computers to access the page when they did not have the appropriate cookie stored locally."

Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Fin does not teach the cited claim limitations. Fin relates to a method and apparatus for transferring state information between a server computer system and a client computer system. As described in Fin, an HTTP client requests a file, such as an HTML document, on an http server, and the http server transmits the file to the HTTP client. In addition, the HTTP server transmits a state object, which describes

certain state information, to the HTTP client. The HTTP client stores the state object, and will typically send the state object back to the http server when making later requests for files on the http server. In a typical embodiment, the state object includes a domain attribute which specifies a domain or network address, and the state object is transmitted from the HTTP client to a server only when the HTTP client makes an HTTP request to the server and the server is within the domain. When a server responds to an http request by returning an HTTP object to a client, the server may also send a piece of state information that the client system will store. In one embodiment of the present invention, the state information is referred to as a "cookie". Included in the state information (the cookie) is a description of a range of URLs for which that state information should be repeated back to. Thus, when the client system sends future HTTP requests to servers that fall within the range of denned URLs, the requests will include a transmittal of the current value of the state object.

Thus, Fin explicitly requires the exchange of cookie data between a server and client only. Fin fails to teach or suggest determining required cookie data on the host client computer associated with the host request, and providing, via the communications link to the slave client, a message comprising the uniform resource locator and the required cookie data associated with the host request with the web page. Fin only addresses transfer of state information or cookies between a client and a server, which is performed to maintain state information after a client-server session has ended and does not address the exchange of state information between two clients. The specification describes a system involving the transfer of cookies between a host and slave client, which is substantially different from exchange of cookies between a server and client. In the former case, the exchange of state information is performed in order to replicate state information from the host client to the slave client so that the slave client may enjoy an identical browsing experience as the host client with respect to a server.

Accordingly, because Fin fails to contemplate the exchange of cookie data between two clients, it certainly cannot teach of suggest a shared view engine for receiving a message from the host client computer, which upon receiving the message from the host client stores a copy of a current state of a client cookie file on the slave client, updates the cookie file on the slave client computer using the required cookie data from the host client received in the

message and issues a slave request for the web page, the slave request comprising a uniform resource locator corresponding to the web page and updated cookie data associated with the web page as recited in amended claim 40. Fin does not disclose any system or method that stores a current copy of a cookie file.

Moreover, Fin having failed to teach or suggest the aforementioned claim elements certainly cannot teach or suggest upon a receipt of a termination signal, terminating the communication link with the host computer and restoring the cookie file to an original state using the copy of the client cookie file. That is, as Fin does not teach or suggest storing a current copy of a cookie file, it cannot teach or suggest upon termination of a session restoring the cookie file to its original state using the stored copy.

Bladow relates to an integrated system of user interfaces for communicating with remote services. A backplane architecture controls and manages the user interfaces by instantiating, launching, overseeing and closing the user interfaces associated with a plurality of applications residing on a remote Web server. The backplane provides a single uniform user authentication procedure during logon for the user interfaces and provides session management for a duration of a user session.

The Examiner cites Bladow for the proposition of "deleting cookie data upon receipt of a termination signal for a communication session". Bladow describes that when the Web server receives entitlement requests from the backplane at the home page or from any other client applications, the Web server makes a connection to a cookiejar and checks if the required information is included in the cookiejar. The cookiejar is a repository for various customer sessions and each session details are included in a cookie. When a connection is established with the cookiejar, the Web server makes a request for the entitlements for a given session. The cookiejar goes through its stored list of cookies, identifies the cookie for the session and returns the cookie to the Web server. When a customer wants to logoff, a logoff request transaction may be sent to the Web server. The Web server the connects to the cookiejar and requests logoff for the session and deletes the cookie.

The mechanism described in Bladow is completely different and for a different purpose than the present system. In particular, in Bladow the cookie information is stored on a server, not a client. This is significant distinction because with the present system, the

cookie file is transmitted from a host client to a slave client in order that the slave client may enjoy the same browsing experience as the host client. In Bladow, the cookie file is retrieved from a cookiejar on a server to handle communication with remote services in a unified manner.

Moreover, because this is a completely different scenario with a different purpose, Bladow cannot teach or suggest that on a client a copy of a current cookie file is performed and that upon termination of the session the cookie file is restored to its original state. Moreover, the cookie data is not determined to be related to a host request as required in amended claim 40.

As the cited references taken alone or in combination fail to teach or suggest the claim elements discussed, claim 40 should be allowed.

Claims 21-23 and 26-29

Claim 21 was rejected under under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin in view of Montulli, and in further view of Grosser, Jr. Claim 21 as amended recites limitations similar to amended claim 40. In particular, claim 21 has been amended to include the limitations of a shared view engine for receiving an identification of the at least one slave client computer, intercepting the request issued by the browser, *determining a required cookie data on the host client associated with the request, wherein the required cookie data describes state information of the host client in relation to the server and does not describe state information of the at least one slave client computer in relation to the server*, and providing, via the communications link to the at least one slave client, a message. In particular, neither Fin, Montulli nor Grosser, Jr. taken alone or in combination teach of suggest determining required cookie data that describes state information of a host client in relation to a server and not of a slave client in relation to the server. As described earlier, Fin only relates to determining cookie data of a client in relation to a server. It does not teach or suggest that the cookie data is related to a host client and is otherwise unrelated to a slave client as required in amended claim 21.

Claims 22-23 and 26-29 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 21. And, Renaud fails to cure any of the deficiencies of Fin, Montulli and Grosser, Jr. Thus,

for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 21, claims 22-23 and 26-29 should be allowed.

Claims 30-31 and 34-39

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Fin in view of Montulli, and in further view of Grosser, Jr. Claim 30 as amended recites limitations similar to amended claim 21. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 21, claim 30 should be allowed.

Claims 31 and 34-39 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 30. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 30, claims 31 and 34-39 should be allowed.

Claims 41-46

Independent claim 41 recites a server based shared view system comprising a slave/host client file that associates each of at least one host client computer with at least one slave client computer; and a server based shared view engine, *wherein the server based shared view engine receives a receives a message that includes an identifier for each of at least one shared view client, updates the slave/host client file by associating the at least one identifier for each shared view client with an identifier of a host computer issuing the message, and upon receiving a request for content and associated state information from the host client computer over a communications network, determines at least one associated slave client computer by retrieving associated slave client computers in the slave/host client file using an identifier of the host computer, and transmits data pertaining to the request to the host client computer and each of the at least one associated slave client computers utilizing the state information.*

As none of the references taken alone or in combination teach or suggest such a server based shared view system, claim 41 should be allowed. Claims 42-46 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claim 41. Thus, for at least the reasons stated with respect to claim 41, claims 42-26 should be allowed.

.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 16, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439